

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended. The applicants respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated September 1, 2000.

The courtesy extended by Examiner Wallerson during the November 28, 2000 interview is gratefully acknowledged. The substance of the discussion during the interview are incorporated into the following remarks.

**As to the Merits:**

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejections:

- (1) claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kojima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,412,490) in view of Ono (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,496); and
- (2) claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kojima in view of Ono and in further view of Sakaue (European Patent Publication No. 0 673 147 A2).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended. The applicants respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated September 1, 2000.

The courtesy extended by Examiner Wallerson during the November 28, 2000 interview is gratefully acknowledged. The substance of the discussion during the interview are incorporated into the following remarks.

**As to the Merits:**

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejections:

- (1) claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kojima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,412,490) in view of Ono (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,496); and
- (2) claims 4, 5, 9, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kojima in view of Ono and in further view of Sakaue (European Patent Publication No. 0 673 147 A2).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Significant structural arrangements of the applicants' claimed invention, as amended, now include a main body including a base having an exposed upper surface and a multi-purpose tray provided on said exposed upper surface of said base.

Although, the Examiner admits that the primary reference of Kojima "does not clearly disclose a multi-purpose tray below the document sheet outlet tray, and a recording sheet supply part located below the main body and independent of the multi-purpose tray for holding stacked recording sheets which are supplied one at a time, the recording sheet supply part including a paper cassette which is attachable and detachable from the image recording device,"<sup>1</sup> the Examiner relies on the secondary reference of Ono for teaching such deficiencies or drawbacks of Kojima.

More specifically, the Examiner asserts that Ono discloses "an image processing system comprising a paper tray (which reads on a multi-purpose tray) (94, figure 1 and column 6, lines 1-2) for holding recording media."<sup>2</sup>

However, Ono fails to disclose that the paper tray 94 is provided on an exposed upper surface of a base. Instead, Ono discloses that paper tray 94 projects from the lateral face of the machine.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see, lines 15 - 19, page 3 of the outstanding Action.

<sup>2</sup> Please see, lines 1 -2, page 4 of the outstanding Action.

This is in sharp contrast to the present invention wherein multi-purpose tray 6 is located on an exposed upper surface of a base of the main body of the image recording device and does not project from a lateral face of the machine.

Thus, even if, arguendo, the teachings of **Kojima** and **Ono** can be combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combined teachings would still fall far short in fully meeting the applicants' claimed invention. As such, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have found the applicants' claimed invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on **Kojima** or **Ono**, singly or in combination.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest recitations of claims 1 - 13 and requested that the Examiner allow these claims, along with the entire application, to issue. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1- 13, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully solicited.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,  
MCLELAND & NAUGHTON



Thomas E. Brown  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,450

Atty. Docket No. **971154**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 659-2930  
TEB:rnj

H:\FLOATERS\TEB\teb\971154\2nd Amendment Final.wpd